

**SALEM PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
(PZC)
REGULAR MEETING
February 17, 2015
7:00**

CALL TO ORDER: G. Fogarty called the meeting to order at 7:06.

Present: G. Fogarty, J. Duncan, R. Amato, G. Walter, V. Smith, R. Savalle, E. Wenzel
Alt. J. Gadbois Alt., R. Serra (SECCOG Planner)

Absent: R. LaBonte, E. Natoli Alt

Guests See File Copy

J. Gadbois was seated for R. LaBonte

PUBLIC HEARING: Discussion of text amendments with possible action on amendments/additions of Section 3.15 (required floor area), Section 3.21 (Accessory Apartments), Section 3.21.1 b, c, d, e, f, g, & h, Section 3.21.2a, b, c, & d, Section 4.1.2, (2 family home minimum lot size) Section 5.1.2, (2 family home minimum lot size and net buildable area) Section 4.5*, (2 family home net buildable area) of the Salem Zoning Regulations. Proposed addition of an Aquifer Protection Overlay Zone(s) Section 25 of the Salem Zoning Regulations and proposed Aquifer Protection Overlay Zone to the Town of Salem Zoning map.

G. Fogarty read the public hearing procedures to the audience. She stated she would take each amendment separately for discussion.

V. Smith read the legal notice.

R. Serra informed the public that the reasons for the proposed amendments are to offer more housing opportunities. He stated the commission decided on these amendments because they are in the POCD as recommendations/consideration.

MINIMUM HOUSE SIZE

R. Serra introduced the first proposed amendment which would lower the minimum house size from 1000 sq. ft. to 850 sq. ft. He stated there are many houses in town now that are smaller than 1000 sq. ft. but that they predate zoning regulations. He stated it could broaden housing options.

Public Comment:

K. Lyden, Forrest Drive-applauds the commission for trying to open up housing options and alternatives. He did not think lowering the square footage was a negative for the town.

P. Sielman was in favor of lowering the minimum house size to allow for more affordable housing for young families

TWO FAMILY HOUSING ON LESS ACREAGE

R. Serra informed the audience of the proposed amendment allowing two family homes on 1 ½ times the acreage in place of twice the acreage now required.

Public Comment

G. Pech-Darling Rd. supports the amendment. (called in remotely)

ACCESSORY APARTMENT

R. Serra explained the accessory apartment amendment. He stated the significant changes from the existing regulation are:

- Allows non family residents
- Allows accessory apartments to be detached from the main residence
- Maximum square footage requirements
- Architectural design standards
- Only one accessory apartment on the property
- Only two people can live in the accessory apartment
- The owner of the property has to live in one of the two residences.

Public Comment

N. Rabe-33 Valley Drive asked about the septic requirements and does the sanitarian have enough information to make the decision.

R. Serra stated that Uncas Health District is now providing sanitarian services to the town and they were consulted on the amendment.

N. Rabe asked if there should be a minimum square footage requirement.

R. Serra thought there are health code requirements that address that issue.

E. Burr-44 Emerald Glen. Stated health aspects are a priority for any property. He is in favor of attached accessory apartments. If the commission were to allow a detached unit then it should be limited to one per property.

R. Serra stated that was already in the amendment

S. Spang-129 Hartford Road. Stated she was in favor of detached accessory apartments as long as they meet current setbacks. She thought the 50 ft. maximum distance from the main residence was arbitrary and should be omitted.

S. Spang questioned the architectural standards for the zone. She stated there are many different architectural types in a neighborhood and who would be the one to determine what was acceptable and what was not.

Casey Crafton-160 Old Colchester Road. Stated he was in favor of detached accessory apartments. He pointed out that they still need the same services as an attached apartment. Fifty feet is an arbitrary number, maybe for something that is already existing should have more leniency.

G. Pech-Darling Road. Stated that people that had an existing out building larger than 800 sq. ft. would be penalized.

R. Serra stated that the Commission is trying to maintain the single family look to the property. It was noted that even though the building might be larger than 800 sq. ft. it doesn't mean that it could not be portioned off to comply with the regulation.

N. Rabe-33 Valley Dr. asked if all regulations are subject to a variance.

R. Serra stated they were.

J. Perkins asked why there is an 800 sq. ft. maximum.

R. Serra stated they are trying to distinguish between the main residence and the accessory residence.

P. Robillard-178 Old Colchester Rd. Stated the 50 ft from the main residence for a detached unit should be greater and from how/where is it

measured. He stated 800 sq.ft. maximum should be greater, maybe 1000 sq.ft.

K. Lyden-Forest Dr. stated that the two people per accessory apartment would be hard to enforce if detached. He likes the attached accessory apartment and suggested doing the recommendation in steps. He is in favor of architectural design approvals

B. Neddo-71 Forrest Dr. Asked if the proposed amendments applies to the Seasonal/Residential Zone

G. Pech-Darling Road. If you allow only attached what do you do about existing accessory apartments which are detached.

E. Burr stated he is in favor of the regulation and commended the commission on their work.

Aquifer Protection Overlay Zone

R. Serra explained what constitutes an aquifer and that there is a move by the state to protect aquifers. He stated they are determined by soils and these areas have a large amounts of ground water.

N. Rabe-Valley Drive. There are many residences in the proposed zone, how will the regulations be enforced.

R. Serra stated either in the permitting phase or by reports of violation.

K. Lyden is in support of the amendment

E. Burr is in support of the amendment

J. Griggs-Is above ground propane acceptable?

There were written correspondence from SECCOG and the River COG in response to the referral by the commission about the proposed regulation changes. They found no inter-municipal conflicts.

M/S/C (Amato/Smith) to close the public hearing at 8:37

PETITIONERS: None

PUBLIC COMMENT-None

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING(S): N/A

OLD BUSINESS: None

NEW BUSINESS: None

ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS REPORT/INLAND WETLANDS AND CONSERVATION COMMISSION REPORT: No Report

CORRESPONDENCE: None

PLUS/DELTAS: The Commission discussed the positive and negative aspects of the meeting.

ADJOURNMENT:

M/S/C (Walter) to adjourn at 8:41 PM. Vote: Approved Unanimously.

Respectfully Submitted,
Sue Spang
Recording Secretary